

REMARKS/ARGUMENT**Regarding the Claims in General:**

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-16, and 18-19 are pending. By this communication, claim 1 has been replaced by claim 19, claims 8 and 17 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-16, and 18 have been amended address the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action, to conform to customary idiomatic English, and U.S. claim practice, and to conform dependency.

Regarding The Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the continuing indication that claims 5-7 and 14-16 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form incorporating the limitations of their respective parent claims. Because these claims are all directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1 or 10, which are believed to be allowable as amended, claims 5-7 14-16 have been retained in dependent form pending the Examiner's further consideration.

Regarding the Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112:

Claim 10 has been amended to expressly recite the viewfinder.

Regarding the Prior Art Rejections:

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-4, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 17 were rejected as unpatentable over Guichard et al. U.S. Patent 5,357,870 (Guichard) in view of Tomitaka U.S. Patent 5,430,809 (Tomitaka). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that even if it would be obvious to combine the teachings of these references, the result would not meet the terms of the claims. As the Examiner recognizes, applicants are mainly concerned with improving the usability of studio type video cameras, particularly those having liquid crystal display (LCD) viewfinders, for which off-axis viewing can be a problem. In such applications, image composition and artistic issues require the camera operator to be moving the camera constantly, and the inability to see clearly the product of his or her work without constantly having to move to stay on-axis with the viewfinder as the camera is panned

or tilted, or constantly having to adjust the viewfinder, can be both distracting and tedious, and could easily have an adverse effect on the quality of the camera work.

Guichard is concerned with a tiltable terminal display unit for a videophone or the like. In the Office Action, the Examiner has acknowledged that the image in Guichard's monitor is not an image of the field of view of the television camera itself (see Response to Arguments, paragraph 4).

Tomitaka is directed to an image processing system which allows the field of view of a video camera to track an object being photographed, e.g., to keep a person in the field of view of the camera. There is nothing in this patent which discloses, teaches or suggests using a separate image; detector to track the movements of the face of the camera operator.

The distinguishing features of the invention are clearly recited in independent claims 19 (which replaces claim 1) and 10. Claim 19, for example, is now explicitly directed to a television camera viewfinder system, and calls for "... a viewfinder operative to display an image of the field of view of a television camera ..." Claim 10 recites the same feature.

As the Examiner recognizes, there is nothing like this in Guichard. Nor would it be obvious to modify Guichard to provide such a viewfinder irrespective of what is disclosed, taught or suggested in Tomitaka, since it would serve no useful purpose. In Guichard, the displayed image is that of the remote participant in the video phone conversation, not someone or something local.

Claim 19 also calls for:

an image pickup device adapted to generate an output representative of an image of the face of a television camera operator; and

a controller responsive the output signal from said image pickup device to operate said viewfinder mounting mechanism to maintain said viewfinder substantially on axis with the line of sight of the television camera operator.

and claim 10 further calls for:

a calculation circuit operative to calculate a central position of the face of the television camera operator in response to said face image output of said image pickup device; and

a control circuit operative to drive a motor for panning and/or tilting said viewfinder in response to the central position calculated.

Tomitaka teaches tracking in image in the field of view of the television camera itself. there is no suggestion for the view finder to track movement of the camera operator. Thus, even if the teachings of the references are combined, the result will not be a display of a *locally generated television camera viewfinder image* which tracks movement of the camera operator so that the display remains substantially on axis with his or her line of sight. Claims 10 and 19 are accordingly not obvious over Guichard in view of Tomitaka, and should be allowed.

The other rejected claims are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 10 or claim 19, and should be allowed, along with claims 5-7, 9, 14-16, and 18, for the reasons stated above, and also because they recite features which, in combination with the features of their parent claims, are not taught or suggested in the references, either alone, or in combination.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to (703) 872-9306, addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Lawrence A Hoffman

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Lawrence A Hoffman

Signature

September 14, 2004

Date of Signature

LAH:cbf

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence A Hoffman

Lawrence A Hoffman

Registration No.: 22,436

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700